
Board for Professional Engineers
Business Meeting Minutes

DATE: October 9, 2025

TIME: 09:45 AM

LOCATION: 100 S. Charles St.
Tower 1
Baltimore, MD 21202
(Teleconference via Google Meet)
Access Using Video Conferencing
meet.google.com/vez-tjmx-mbr
Phone: +1 401-552-4499
PIN: 392138700

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sallye Perrin, PE, *Chair*
Edward (Ed) Hubner, *Vice-chair, PE*
Karl Rickert, PE
Dhrubajyoti (DJ) Biswas, PE
Kathryn Gunkel, PE
Lily Kuitcha, PE
Judi Miller, RA, *Consumer*
Tracey Clark, *Consumer*

MEMBERS ABSENT: NONE

STAFF PRESENT: Zevi Thomas, *Executive Director*
Raquel Meyers, *Assistant Executive Director*
Matthew Venuti, AAG, *Board Counsel*
Shavon Cooper, *Board Operations Officer II*
Hannah Belcher, *Office Secretary*

OTHERS PRESENT: Stef Goodenow, NCEES Representative
Greg Morgan, NSPE-MD
Aajah Harris, Policy Director, Office of the Commissioner
Niole Miles

Leandro Rodriguez
Melissa Cannata
Amber Brook

Meeting Called to Order

Mr. Thomas announced a quorum. Board Chair, Sallye Perrin called the meeting to order at 9:46 a.m. Ms. Perrin began with the decision to move "Old Business" NCEES Exam Representative Presentation up on the agenda to discuss the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) exam approval process.

Old Business

a. NCEES Exam Representative Presentation

Ms. Perrin welcomed Ms. Stef Goodenow, NCEES Chief Officer of Member Services. Ms. Goodenow opened the discussion sharing information from some jurisdictions that already use approval process to grant candidates eligibility to sit for the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) Exam. The Maryland Board for Professional Engineers would like to determine how this process might work within the framework of current Maryland laws and regulations. Ms. Goodenow began by stating this process includes the types of approvals NCEES offers. For the benefit of new Board members, Ms. Perrin asked Ms. Goodenow to explain what is meant by decoupling. Ms. Goodenow explained decoupling means removing the requirement to have the required years of experience prior to being eligible to take the PE Exam. This would mean the applicant would have the flexibility to take the exam when it's more convenient for them, but the required years of experience would still be necessary when applying for state licensure. Currently more than 30 jurisdictions have decoupled, and those jurisdictions have approved candidates through one of the NCEES current auto-approve models. Some boards have been decoupled for more than 10 years.

Some common questions she's received throughout this process are as follows: Can applicants take the PE exam right after taking the FE exam? Yes. The three-to-four-year mark is when more applicants take and have better passing rates. Empirically, the more current work experience applicants have; it has shown an increase in them passing the PE exam. What about the integrity of the exam? NCEES system has several security features which prevent applicants from taking the PE exam repeatedly. NCEES requires examinees to only take the exam one time per testing windows. Testing windows are in the quarters of a year. Also, per NCEES requirements, an examinee cannot take the exam more than three times in a 12-month period. Computer-based testing offers more exam security to ensure a satisfactory process. There are two NCEES approval options. One is more restrictive than the other. The fully auto-approved restriction has a verified FE Exam requirement before the system can automatically mark candidates as approved. Some Boards start off with the auto-approval process with an education restriction. NCEES system has the ability to review someone's education if it's Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC), Engineering Technology Accreditation Commission (ETAC), or Applied and Natural Science Accreditation Commission (ANSAC), if accredited by ABET these individuals must have this information listed in their accounts and verified with an official transcript. With this option, if the education and FE exam requirements are met the system automatically approves them.

NCEES approvals allow every Board to have an attestation that every applicant is required to complete during the registration process. These attestations provide each board with the

opportunity to include statements, instructions, or quoted statutes and regulations regarding what is required for licensure for that jurisdiction. If an examinee passes the PE exam, but does not meet the requirements of that jurisdiction, then licensure can be denied based on such attestations. This means passing the exam would not automatically grant the candidate a PE license. Ms. Goodenow stated that one Board, Colorado, is not decoupled but they do auto-approve. Colorado has an attestation stating that the applicant must have 4 years of work experience before sitting for the exam. It does depend on how each Board chooses to phrase their attestation. Ms. Perrin asked if using the auto-approve option would require all applicants to have an NCEES council record. Ms. Goodenow answered "No". Education is required to be entered when anyone registers for an exam along with additional personal information. Boards that use the auto-approve process or are decoupled encourage applicants to have their record available to send to the Board for their initial license. Up to 36 Boards currently use these records for the initial licensure process and not just for Comity licenses. In the case of international applicants, they will end up in the manual queue and would need manual processing by each jurisdiction's staff. This also applies to applicants that do not meet the FE requirement. The instructions would state "once you have passed both exams and have certain requirements then applicants are required to apply for State licensure."

Ms. Goodenow explained that work experience would be a part of the record and not the exam approval process. The system allows someone to take the exam based on the FE exam verification and if education restrictions apply, then education would be verified. Work experience would apply when applicants apply directly to the Maryland PE Board for licensure. Mr. Hubner raised concerns about possible litigation if an applicant passes the PE exams, does not have the required work experience but then applies to the Maryland Board. Ms. Goodenow explained applicants would be held to their signed attestation in such circumstances.

Mr. Venuti pointed out that this would not change the requirements for licensure. This would equate to how the Board handles approval for exam applicants. If an applicant gets approved to take the exam, passes, and then does not have the required work experience; then it would be a denial of licensure. Ms. Goodenow suggests contacting Joyce Young of the Colorado Board to discuss their current process including their attestation.

The vast majority of passing scores come from candidates at the third-year mark of work experience. Ms. Cooper mentioned applicants waiting long periods of time to schedule their exam with NCEES after being initially approved by the Board and having their exam manually authorized with NCEES. Each examinee that submits a registration to take the exam must be manually approved each time, even those retaking the exam. With the auto-approval process, the manual approval process would be obsolete. Applicants who meet the criteria set within the chosen model would be marked as approved after meeting the criteria. The computer-based testing process would allow the process to be more secure. NCEES system has checks and balances to ensure applicants cannot test multiple times in the same test window or tracking when and how many times the exams are being taken. The discussion was wrapped up, and thanks was given to Ms. Goodenow for the information. Ms. Perrin stated this matter should be added to November 13, 2025, agenda for further discussions.

Approval of September 11, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Ms. Perrin announced a revision on page. 9 minutes of the meeting. Ms. Perrin announced the approval of the revised September 11, 2025, meeting minutes. Motion (I) was called by Ms. Perrin

to approve the revised September 11, 2025, meeting minutes. The motion was moved by Mr. Biswas, seconded by Mr. Rickert, and unanimously approved.

Applications Approved by Board Members

Motion (II) was made by Ms. Perrin for the Board to approve the applications placed in the approved file. Moved by Mr. Biswas, seconded by Mr. Hubner, and unanimously carried to approve 12 applications for PE licensure by reciprocity and 49 applications for the Principles and Practice of Engineering (PE) exam.

Applications for PE Licensure by Reciprocity are as follows:

ARNOLD, NICHOLAS (65805)
BRAZING, HAVAL (65800)
DUNN, JOHN (65803)
GIBIDES, JUSTIN (65806)
HAZELWOOD, RYAN (65799)
HOSSAIN, ROKSANA (65804)
JOHNSON, KENDELL (26907)
MOHSEN, RADI (65802)
SAMMETA, NAGARJUNA (65475)
SANCHEZ, CRISTOBAL (54050)
SU, TONY (65850)
ZAYAS, JIMMY (65801)

There were two Applications for PE License by Reciprocity put into the "Needs More Information" folder:

Attallah, Jaser

Atanasov, Stoyan G.

No Reciprocity Application was denied.

Applications for PE Licensure by Transfer of Grades are as follows:

Chauhan, Harjasdeep

Kayvan, Sodagari

Three Transfer of Grades Applications were put into the "Needs More Information" Folder:

Atanaso, Stoyan
Attallah, Jaser

Johns, Christopher

There were no Transfer of Grades applications denied.

Applications for the Principles and Practices of Engineering Exam are as follows

ADEYEMO, OLUWAYEMI
ADLOORI, BHARATHSAI
AL SHAWI, AHMED
ALMON, ERIC R.
BLOUNT, TIMOTHY
BOLLINGER, PATRICK
BOYLE, PATRICK
BRYMESSER, JARED
BUSTILLOS TARIFA, FRANZ
DALY, ANDREW
DAR, DAVID
DONNELLY, SEAN C.
ELLIS, MARIA
FERGUSON, THOMAS
FISEHA, ZERAYOHANES G.
FLORES VIJIL, JOSUE A.
GELAW, YONAS
GOHIL, FALGUN,
GORJIPOUR, HADI
GRIGORIAN, ARAM
JEFFERSON, BRANDON M.
JEFFRYES, SEAN
KNUTSEN, DANIEL
LEE, CHENG-YI
LEMLEM, ADDISU

LITTLE, DANIEL
MAHABA, AHMED D.
NOORI, SHUJAUDDIN
NWOSU, ALEX G.
ODURO, SAMUEL
OLAOLORUN, GBENGA
OXENREIDER, TRAVIS J.
PETERSON, ANDREW
QAMAR, TABASSUM
RAMADHAN, HARIM H.
RUIZ, GERARDO
SALEHI, AHMAD
SARECKY, GABRIEL
SCALISE, JEFFREY
SCHILPP, THOMAS M.
SMITH, RYAN
SPENCE, KIRASTIN
VALENTINE, AARON R.
WALKER, BRIAN
WESTERFIELD III, EDWARD
WHITBY, AJAI N.
WHITE, ANTHONY
WUN, THOMAS
ZHANG, EDDIE

There was one exam applications placed in the "needs more information" folder:
Brown, Courtney

There were two Denied Applications:

ANTELMAN, MARC

ISRAEL, DANIE

Correspondence

A. 09.23.03.09 Clarification Request

A similar case occurred in the past where two engineers work on a project and one person seals. The difference with this correspondence is that the Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) need to only consider the additions to these drawings. When an engineer takes over the

www.labor.maryland.gov

complete project, he should only sign off on the part completed by him/her. Mr. Venuti confirms the law states an engineer is only liable for their own revisions and crossing out the initial engineer's name or registration doesn't change liability. Ms. Perrin recommended the response to this correspondence be reviewed by Mr. Rickert or Mr. Hubner. Mr. Venuti asked if we should contact the code official in question. Ms. Miller suggests clearly stating the law, and Ms. Perrin agreed to include the law recommendations from the Board. Mr. Venuti advised it to be limited response because of unknown details in this case. Mr. Rickert added if any new work has any effect on the original engineers' design the second engineer needs to be responsible for the effect of his work on the initial engineers' design. Ms. Perrin agreed and asked Mr. Thomas to draft a letter and have Board members review this draft before issuing this response.

Update from CPC Committee

A revised application from a CPC provider applicant. The applicant satisfied the requirements and is therefore approved: Structural Inc. The CPC Committee is still waiting for revised information from another CPC Provider.

Moved (III) was called by Ms. Perrin to approve by the Board the recommendation for approval CPC Providers. Moved by Mr. Hubner, seconded by Ms. Miller and unanimously voted for approval and no opposition.

New Business

Mr. Hubner introduced the matter discussed with Mr. Biswas about an applicant that has a non-accredited degree but has a master's degree and asks the Board for clarification if this is appropriate. Mr. Hubner looked up the University of Maryland's requirements for a master's degree. Their policy is that a master's degree is a minimum of 30 credit hours with 12 of those credit hours being in the subject of the master's degree. Would the master's degree validate the undergraduate degree? Ms. Perrin states that if the master's degree is from a program that has an accredited undergraduate program, i.e. a Civil Engineering Master's degree from the University of Maryland which has an accredited Civil Engineering undergraduate program, then that master's program, because it is within an ABET accredited program, can be seen as the qualifying degree but the candidate still need 4 years of professional experience. For clarification, the university is not ABET accredited; the engineering program is. The master's degree can also be evaluated including requesting a Curriculum Checklist of the undergraduate to review without having to request a credential evaluation. Mr. Rickert referenced Title 09.23.05.06 discussing how to approve a master's or doctorate program. Mr. Venuti confirmed sections (d) & (c) of this Title Act.

Update from Ethics Committee

None

Report from Executive Director

None

Report from Board Counsel

None

Complaint Committee Report

Mr. Rickert requested to enter Executive Session. Ms. Perrin, called Motion (IV), moved by Mr. Biswas, seconded by Ms. Miller to enter Executive Session at 10:50 am.

Executive Session

This session was permitted to be closed pursuant to General Provisions Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, §3-305(b) (7) to seek counsel on an application matter. Upon completion of this closed session, the Board reconvened its public meeting at 11:41 am.

04-PE-26 – Investigating

18-PE-25 – Investigating

-Reinstatements

1. Applicant is a University Professor – that has not been registered for 15 years. Board advises paying the reinstatement fees and completion of 32 professional development hours (PDH) credits, to attain reinstatement.
2. No evidence of related engineering work done while licensed suspension – Board to issue a letter presenting the candidates with options for reinstating in Maryland.

Motion (V) was made by Ms. Perrin, seconded by Ms. Gunkel, and unanimously carried to approve the report of the Complaint Committee.

Applications Approved Administratively for Reciprocity

There were 82 applications, supported by NCEES Model Law Engineer records, that were administratively approved for licensure.

Other Business

The next meeting is November 13, 2025. If there's items from the Complaint Committee which need to be added to the agenda, please inform Ms. Cooper.

Adjournment

Motion (VI) was called by Ms. Perrin for adjournment, Mr. Hubner opposed stating that the Board did not discuss denials and stated that he had two denials. Both applied under subsection 14-305(d) but did not have the 12 years of required experience. Ms. Perrin stated she had some for "Needs More Information". One reciprocal application had his FE waived and the applicant was looking to be licensed in Maryland and needed to be licensed under 305 (d) and show they have 12 years of experience. Mr. Hubner asked Ms. Cooper to check this applicant under the Reciprocal "Needs More Information" and she confirmed. Ms. Hubner instructed Ms. Cooper to inform the applicant that it was noted that their FE was waived. This applicant needs to provide the Board with 12 years of the required work experience to receive a reciprocal license. Ms. Cooper agreed to notify the applicant of this. Ms. Perrin called Motion (VII) to ratify the denials. Moved by Mr.

Biswas, seconded by Mr. Biswas and unanimously approved. Motion (VIII) was called by Ms. Perrin to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Miller and unanimously agreed to adjourn at 11:48 a.m.

_____ With Corrections

_____X_____ Without Corrections

Chair's Signature: _____
Signature-on-File

Date: 11/17/2025 _____